

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/795,789	03/08/2004	Steven J. Svoboda	26.2.D09/USA	7704
James W. Mille	7590 10/04/2007 er, Esa.		EXAM	INER
Suite 1960			REDDING, DAVID A	
Rand Tower 527 Marquette Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Minneapolis, MN 55402			3723	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/795,789	SVOBODA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David A. Redding	1744			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-17,19-23 and 32-37 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8,18 and 24-31 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	is/are withdrawn from considera	ation.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 March 2004</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/20/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/795,789 Page 2

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-8,26-29 in the reply filed on 7/13/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that claims 18, 24-31 are not distinct from the elected claims. This is persuasive and claims 18,24-31 are rejoined with the elected claims. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

- 1

Application/Control Number: 10/795,789

Art Unit: 1744

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6,8,24,26,27,28,29,30,31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Black and Decker BV-006 Leaf Collection Systems brochure in view of USP 5,291,722 ('722).

The Black and Decker brochure discloses a leaf collection system comprising a container for holding the leaves with a hose attached to the container and connectable to a blower vac. The container is more vertical than horizontal in dimension.

The '722 patent discloses a cart 10 capable of holding leaves having a bag which is secured to the cart and having an opening which is capable of being connected to a hose. The cart and bag are more horizontal than vertical. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the wheeled container in the Black and Decker brochure with the cart and bag in the '722 patent in view of the known use of the cart and bag in the '722 patent.

Claims 1-5,18,24-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black and Decker brochure in view of USP 4,335,897 (Muller, Jr.) and US 2003/0131435 (Madhat).

The Black and Decker brochure discloses a leaf collection system comprising a container for holding the leaves with a hose attached to the container and connectable to a blower vac. The container is more vertical than horizontal in dimension.

Art Unit: 1744

The Muller, Jr. patent discloses a cart 1 capable of holding leaves. The Madhat publication discloses a leaf bag made from fabric having an inlet directly connectable to a hose, the bag having a zipper for emptying the contents. The cart and bag are more horizontal than vertical. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the wheeled container in the Black and Decker brochure with the cart in the Muller, Jr. patent and provide the bag of the Madhat publication in view of the known use of the bag and cart.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A. Redding whose telephone number is 571-272-1276. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 6:00 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran-Piazza can be reached on 571-272-1224. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/795,789

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ David Redding / Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744 Page 5

DAR